

Applicant : Kumar et al.
Serial No. : 10/723,742
Filed : November 26, 2003
Page : 15 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-148001 / 2003P00828 US

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet 5 of the drawings includes changes to FIG. 3 and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 3.

In FIG. 3, the floating reference line between the "Search" box and reference numeral 256 has been removed, and reference numeral 256 has been underlined to clarify that "256" refers to whole search area, and the box around "Search" has been removed to make this heading look less like a button. Support for this amendment can be found in the originally filed FIG. 3 (informal) and in the specification at page 8, lines 1-11. No new matter has been added.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (1 page)

REMARKS

In response to the Action mailed April 4, 2006, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-4, 6-13, 15-16, 18-25, 27-28, and 31-36; canceled claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 26, and 29-30; and added new claims 37-39. As such, Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks. Also submitted with this response is an Information Disclosure Statement, which the Applicants request be considered, initialed and returned with the next Office Action.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Vaughn for the courtesies extending during the telephone interview of October 2, 2006, during which Applicants' representative (hereafter, "Applicants") discussed Ohnishi, U.S. Pat. App. 2003/0187876 ("Ohnishi"), and claim amendments that are believed to distinguish over Ohnishi, which are described in greater detail below.

Objections to the Drawings and Specification

The Office Action objected to the drawings and the specification because certain reference numerals appeared in the figures without being appropriately referenced in the specification. Each objection is addressed below.

In response to the objection to "110" appearing in FIG. 2A without a corresponding reference in the specification, the specification has been corrected. In particular, a reference to element "102" has been corrected to reference element "110," as intended. Support for correction of this typographical error is apparent from FIG. 2A and from the context of the amended text; no new matter has been added. (Note that this amendment also addresses the objection to "separator 102" in the specification.)

In response to the objection to "206" in FIG. 2E without a corresponding reference in the specification, the specification has been corrected. In particular, a reference to element "200" has been corrected to reference element "206," as intended. Support for correction of this

typographical error is apparent from FIG. 2E and from the context of the amended text; no new matter has been added. (Note that this amendment also addresses the objection to the “title box 200” in the specification.)

In response to the objection to the “search area 256” in the specification, FIG. 3 has been amended. In particular, the floating reference line between the “Search” box and reference numeral 256 has been removed, and reference numeral 256 has been underlined to clarify that “256” refers to whole search area, and the box around “Search” has been removed to make this heading look less like a button. Support for this amendment can be found in the originally filed FIG. 3 (informal) and in the specification at page 8, lines 1-11. No new matter has been added.

In light of the above amendments, Applicants request that the objections to the specification and drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 13-14 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohnishi, and claims 3-12, 15-24 and 27-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Corneille et al., U.S. Pat. App. 2005/0075115 (“Corneille”). Applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1, 13 and 25; canceled claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 26 and 29-30; and amended dependent claims 3, 4, and 6-12; 15-16 and 18-24; and 27-28 and 31-36 for consistency. Support for the amendments is discussed below. The amendments add no new matter. Applicants submit that each of the independent claims 1, 13 and 25 defines subject matter that is patentable over Ohnishi, Corneille and the combination of Ohnishi and Corneille, as do the pending dependent claims 3-4 and 6-12; 15-16 and 18-24; and 27-28 and 31-36.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that an interaction center agent device receives a broadcast electronic message from a supervisor work station, where the broadcast electronic message is received by multiple interaction center agent devices. Independent claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the broadcast electronic message is automatically scrolled

across the common message area (e.g., automatically displaying a text or graphical element of the broadcast electronic message as moving across the common message area).

Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed specification, including, for example, at page 2, lines 9-11 and 30-31; page 3, lines 17-22; page 4, lines 5-8, 8-23 and 27-28; page 5, lines 17-20 and 23-25; page 7, lines 14-16; and page 8, lines 17-21. Accordingly, the amendments add no new matter.

Ohnishi describes an “office-counter work supporting system that can support an operator in his/her office counter work by properly providing to the operator various information on each customer collected via various channels...” (Ohnishi, ¶ 0011.) “For example, at a counter of a financial institution such as a bank, a terminal of a business system is allocated for an operator to conduct an (sic) office counter work.” (Ohnishi, ¶ 0008.) Ohnishi illustrates a system in which various information is displayed for the operator of the terminal. (See, for example, Ohnishi FIGS. 6A-D, 8-10, 15.)

Ohnishi does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter set forth in Applicants' claim 1. For example, Ohnishi does not disclose or suggest a broadcast electronic message that is received by multiple interaction center agent devices. Ohnishi describes some communication between an operator terminal and a supervisor terminal, but Applicant finds no disclosure or suggestion of *broadcast* communication between a supervisor terminal and multiple operator terminals. As another example, Ohnishi does not disclose or suggest displaying a broadcast electronic message by automatically scrolling the broadcast electronic message across a common message area (e.g., automatically displaying a text or graphical element of the broadcast electronic message as moving across the common message area). The combination of Ohnishi and Corneille also does not disclose or suggest the automatic scrolling limitation. In rejecting dependent claims 5 and 6, the Office Action asserted that the combination of Ohnishi and Corneille teach “messages that are scroll enabled” or “controls that enable scrolling features” (Office Action mailed April 4, 2006, at page 7), but Corneille merely illustrates and describes a *scroll bar control*, which is very different than *automatically scrolling* that includes automatically displaying a text or graphical element as *moving across* a common message area.

The subject matter of amended claim 1 gives rise to significant advantages that are not contemplated by Ohnishi or Corneille—alone or in combination. For example, a system that has the capability of receiving broadcast messages (messages that are received at multiple interaction center agent devices) improves communication between agents and a supervisor (see page 3, lines 3-4) and enables flexibility in setting up an interaction center and precludes a need to arrange agents in view of a physical message board (see page 4, lines 8-16). Automatically scrolling the broadcast messages across a common message area allows an agent to view the messages while interacting with a customer. (See page 4, lines 29-30.)

Accordingly, for at the reasons outline above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 and the corresponding dependent claims 3-4 and 6-12 are patentable over Ohnishi and ask that the § 102 rejections based on Ohnishi be withdrawn. In addition, the other pending independent claims 13 and 25 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 and are also believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above in connection with claim 1.

Moreover, claim 25 has been amended to recite *receiving input* from a pointing device corresponding to the interaction center agent device, the input being associated with the common message area, and *pausing the scrolling upon receiving the input*. This additional limitation is also not disclosed or suggested by Ohnishi, Corneille or the combination of Ohnishi and Corneille, and provides an additional basis for patentability for claim 25 and its dependent claims.

For at least the reasons provided above, Applicants ask for the withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections based on Ohnishi, Corneille or the combination of Ohnishi and Corneille of independent claims 1, 13 and 25, and their dependent claims 3-4 and 6-12; 15-16 and 18-24; and 27-28 and 31-36. Applicants also request allowance of new dependent claims 37-39.

New Claims

New claims 37-39 depend from independent claims 1, 13 and 25, and are accordingly believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above. Each of the new claims further recite that the common message area is separate from the work area in the single user interface panel,

such that the information in the work area and the electronic broadcast message in the common message area are simultaneously viewable by the human interaction center agent during the interaction session. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the originally filed specification, including for example, at page 3, lines 20-22, and page 4, lines 24-29.

Accordingly, the new claims add no new matter.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 3-4, 6-13, 15-16, 18-25, 27-28 and 31-39 are in condition for allowance, and ask that the Examiner allow them. Applicants also request that the Information Disclosure Statement being submitted with this response be considered, initialed and returned with the next Office Action.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Kumar et al.
Serial No. : 10/723,742
Filed : November 26, 2003
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-148001 / 2003P00828 US

Enclosed is a \$1200 check for the Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time fee (\$1020) and for the fee associated with submitting the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (\$180). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew J. Smyth
Reg. No. 58,224

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60385145.doc



੮੩